

# INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Application No

PCT/IB2005/050188

## A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER

IPC 7 G06F17/60

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC

## B. FIELDS SEARCHED

Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)

IPC 7 G06F

Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched

Electronic data base consulted during the international search (name of data base and, where practical, search terms used)

EPO-Internal, WPI Data, PAJ

## C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category *	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
X	US 2002/178086 A1 (MARGESON JAYE A ET AL) 28 November 2002 (2002-11-28)  abstract figures 1,2 paragraphs '0052!, '0053!, '0056!, '0059!	1,2,6,9, 11-15, 17-20,22
X	US 2002/056109 A1 (TOMSEN MAI-LAN) 9 May 2002 (2002-05-09) abstract figure 3 paragraphs '0027!, '0038!, '0044!, '0046!, '0049!, '0051!	1-22

☒ Further documents are listed in the continuation of box C.

☒ Patent family members are listed in annex.

### \* Special categories of cited documents:

- \*A\* document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance
- \*E\* earlier document but published on or after the international filing date
- \*L\* document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)
- \*O\* document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means
- \*P\* document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed

- \*T\* later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention
- \*X\* document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone
- \*Y\* document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art.
- \*&\* document member of the same patent family

Date of the actual completion of the international search

13 May 2005

Date of mailing of the international search report

31/05/2005

Name and mailing address of the ISA

European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2  
NL - 2280 HV Rijswijk  
Tel. (+31-70) 340-2040, Tx. 31 651 epo nl,  
Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016

Authorized officer

Gabriel, C

# INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Application No  
PCT/IB2005/050188

## C.(Continuation) DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category *	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
X	US 2003/093794 A1 (THOMAS MCGEE ET AL) 15 May 2003 (2003-05-15)  paragraphs '0011!, '0019!, '0021! -----	1,2,6,9, 11-15, 17-20,22
A	WO 02/25938 A (KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V) 28 March 2002 (2002-03-28) cited in the application abstract -----	1-22
A	KWAN W ET AL: "AN INTELLIGENT AGENT FOR MULTIMEDIA NEWSPAPER" 1995, CANADIAN CONFERENCE ON ELECTRICAL AND COMPUTER ENGINEERING, PAGE(S) 594-597 , XP000568999 abstract page 594, right-hand column, paragraph 2 page 595, left-hand column, paragraph 1 -----	5-8,11, 12,17-21

# INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

Information on patent family members

International Application No

PCT/IB2005/050188

Patent document cited in search report		Publication date		Patent family member(s)	Publication date
US 2002178086	A1	28-11-2002	WO	02091128 A2	14-11-2002
US 2002056109	A1	09-05-2002	AU	7363701 A	05-02-2002
			WO	0208930 A1	31-01-2002
			AU	7140401 A	05-02-2002
			AU	7362601 A	05-02-2002
			AU	7927401 A	05-02-2002
			WO	0209422 A1	31-01-2002
			WO	0209423 A1	31-01-2002
			WO	0208869 A2	31-01-2002
			US	2002013950 A1	31-01-2002
			US	2002104086 A1	01-08-2002
			US	2002054091 A1	09-05-2002
			US	2002016965 A1	07-02-2002
US 2003093794	A1	15-05-2003	EP	1449124 A2	25-08-2004
			WO	03042866 A2	22-05-2003
			JP	2005509949 T	14-04-2005
WO 0225938	A	28-03-2002	CN	1428044 A	02-07-2003
			WO	0225938 A2	28-03-2002
			EP	1323298 A2	02-07-2003
			JP	2004509577 T	25-03-2004

10597284

PCT/IB2005/050188

PCT REQUEST

Print Out (Original in Electronic Form)

VIII-2-1	<p><b>Declaration: Entitlement to apply for and be granted a patent</b>  Declaration as to the applicant's entitlement, as at the international filing date, to apply for and be granted a patent (Rules 4.17(ii) and 51bis.1(a)(ii)), in a case where the declaration under Rule 4.17(iv) is not appropriate:  Name (LAST, First)</p>	<p><b>in relation to this international application</b></p> <p>KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V. is entitled to apply for and be granted a patent by virtue of the following:</p>
VIII-2-1(i)		KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V. is entitled as employer of the inventor, GUTTA, Srinivas
VIII-2-1(i)		KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V. is entitled as employer of the inventor, VERHAEGH, Wilhelmus, Franciscus, Johannes
VIII-2-1(i)		KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V. is entitled as employer of the inventor, MEULEMAN, Petrus, Gerardus
VIII-2-1(i)	This declaration is made for the purposes of:	all designations except the designation of the United States of America

## PCT REQUEST

Print Out (Original in Electronic Form)

VIII-3-1	<b>Declaration: Entitlement to claim priority</b> Declaration as to the applicant's entitlement, as at the international filing date, to claim the priority of the earlier application specified below, where the applicant is not the applicant who filed the earlier application or where the applicant's name has changed since the filing of the earlier application (Rules 4.17(iii) and 51bis.1(a)(iii)) Name	<b>in relation to this international application</b>  KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V. is entitled to claim priority of earlier application No. 60/537,811 by virtue of the following:
VIII-3-1(i)		KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V. is entitled as employer of the inventor, GUTTA, Srinivas
VIII-3-1(i)		KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V. is entitled as employer of the inventor, VERHAEGH, Wilhelmus, Franciscus, Johannes
VIII-3-1(i)		KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V. is entitled as employer of the inventor, MEULEMAN, Petrus, Gerardus
VIII-3-1(i)	This declaration is made for the purposes of:	all designations

10597284

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY  
(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference PHUS040046WO	FOR FURTHER ACTION      See item 4 below	
International application No. PCT/IB2005/050188	International filing date (day/month/year) 17 January 2005 (17.01.2005)	Priority date (day/month/year) 20 January 2004 (20.01.2004)
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V.		

1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 9 sheets, including this cover sheet.

In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I   | Basis of the report   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. II             | Priority  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. III            | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV             | Lack of unity of invention  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V   | Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI             | Certain documents cited   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII           | Certain observations on the international application   |

4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland  Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70	Date of issuance of this report 24 July 2006 (24.07.2006)
	Authorized officer  Cecile Chatel  e-mail: pt13@wipo.int

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D 27 MAY 2005

WIPO

PCT

PCT

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

4/8

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
see form PCT/ISA/220

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**  
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
PCT/B2005/050188

International filing date (day/month/year)  
17.01.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)  
20.01.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
G06F17/60

Applicant  
KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☒ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

### 2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office  
D-80298 Munich  
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d  
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Gabriel, C

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7112



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/IB2005/050188

**Box No. I Basis of the opinion**

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.  
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:  
☐ a sequence listing  
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:  
☐ in written format  
☐ in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:  
☐ contained in the international application as filed.  
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/B2005/050188

---

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

---

**1. Statement**

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	3-5,7,8,10,16,21
	No: Claims	1,2,6,9,11-15,17-20,22
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-22
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-22
	No: Claims	

**2. Citations and explanations**

see separate sheet

---

**Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application**

---

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

see separate sheet

**Re Item V**

**Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;  
citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. The following documents (D1-D4) are referred to in this communication; the numbering will be adhered to in the rest of the procedure:

D1: US 2002/178086 A1 (MARGESON JAYE A ET AL) 28 November 2002 (2002-11-28)

D2: US 2002/056109 A1 (TOMSEN MAI-LAN) 9 May 2002 (2002-05-09)

D3: US 2003/093794 A1 (THOMAS MCGEE ET AL) 15 May 2003 (2003-05-15)

D4: KWAN W ET AL: "AN INTELLIGENT AGENT FOR MULTIMEDIA  
NEWSPAPER" 1995, CANADIAN CONFERENCE ON ELECTRICAL AND  
COMPUTER ENGINEERING, PAGE(S) 594-597 , XP000568999

2. Method claim 1 and corresponding independent system claim 13 do not meet the requirements of Article 33(2) PCT for lack of novelty of their subject-matter. The reasons are the following:

- 2.1 Document discloses, according to all of the features of claim 1,

a computerized method for providing a personalized list of future meetings per subject per user based upon the user's preferences (paragraph 59), comprising the steps of:

obtaining a profile listing various meeting preferences of a user ("seminar topic of interest"; "other preference data" in paragraph 59);

obtaining a list of meetings corresponding to at least a portion of the user's profile, for preparation of a recommended meetings list ("seminars of interest" in paragraph 59); and

sending the user the list of recommended meetings ("email"; "appropriate notification" in paragraph 59).

Hence, claim 1 does not meet the requirements of Article 33(2) PCT for lack of novelty of its subject-matter.

- 2.2 The corresponding system of independent claim 13 for performing the method of claim 1 is also known from document D1 (figures 1,2; paragraph 59).

Hence, claim 13 does also not meet the requirements of Article 33(2) PCT for lack of novelty of its subject-matter.

3. Method claim 1 and independent system claim 13 do not meet the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT for lack of inventive step of their subject-matter. The reasons are the following:

- 3.1 Document D2 discloses,

a computerized method for providing a personalized list of [information items] per subject per user based upon the user's preferences (paragraph 38), comprising the steps of:

obtaining a profile listing various [information items] preferences of a user (paragraphs 44, 49, 51, 52);

obtaining a list of [information items] corresponding to at least a portion of the user's profile, for preparation of a recommended [information items] list ("merchant content / information" in paragraph 44); and

sending the user the list of recommended [information items] (implicit feature of viewing the information presented on a web-site in paragraph 44).

The difference between the subject-matter of claim 1 and the disclosure of D2 is that the information items presented are not merchant content/information, but meeting information.

This difference does however not constitute a technical difference, because the type of information displayed has no effect on the technical working of the system

performing the steps of claim 1.

Since the subject-matter of claim 1 does not differ from the disclosure of D2 in a technical way, a technical problem can not be formulated. If no such technical problem can be formulated, an inventive step can not be acknowledged.

Consequently, claim 1 does not meet the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT for lack of inventive step of its subject-matter.

It is to be noted that claim 1 does also not meet the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT in respect of document D3 (paragraphs 11, 19 and 21), which also discloses the provisioning of information based on a user profile.

- 3.2 The difference between the system of independent claim 13 and the system disclosed in document D2 (figure 3 and accompanying text) is the same non-technical difference as identified above in respect of claim 1.

Hence, claim 13 does also not meet the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT for lack of inventive step of its subject-matter for similar reasons as identified in section 3.1 above.

4. Dependent claims 2-12 and 14-22 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step, the reasons being as follows:

- 4.1 The features of claims 2-4, 10, 14-16 and 21, of determining a user profile based on questions, by monitoring website activities, or by using similar profiles, are known from document D2 (paragraphs 44, 49, 51 and 52).
- 4.2 The features of claims 5-8, 11, 12, 17-20 and 21, of searching the Internet for meetings and associated information, are obvious for finding information specified in the user's profile. See also document D1, paragraph 56 and 59; document D3,

paragraph 11, 19 and 21; or document D4, page 595, left-hand column, first paragraph, which all disclose relevant teachings related to the search of the Internet using explicit or implicit user profiles.

- 4.3 The use of E-mail, in claim 9, is known from document D1 (paragraph 59).
- 4.4 Dependent claims 2-12 and 14-22 do therefore also not meet the requirements of Article 33(2),(3) PCT for lack of novelty and/or inventive step of their subject-matter.

**Re Item VII**

**Certain defects in the international application**

In addition, the following requirements should also be attended to in an amended application to be filed:

1. To meet the requirements of Rule 6.3 (b) (i) and (ii) PCT, newly filed independent claims should be properly cast in the two part form, with those features which are part of the prior art (see document D1) being placed in the preamble.
2. The features of the claims should be provided with reference signs placed in **parenthesis** to increase the intelligibility of the claims (Rule 6.2 (b) PCT). This applies to both the preamble and the characterising portion of all claims.
3. In order to indicate more completely the background art useful for understanding the invention, the above-mentioned documents D1-D3 should be acknowledged in the description (Rule 5.1 (a) (ii) PCT).
4. When filing amended claims the applicant should at the same time bring the description into conformity with the amended claims (Rule 5.1 (a) (iii) PCT).
5. The vague and imprecise statement ("which modifications are meant to be covered by the spirit and scope of the appended claims") in the last line of the description on

page 7 implies that the subject-matter for which protection is sought may be different to that defined by the claims, thereby resulting in lack of clarity (Article 6 PCT) when used to interpret them (see also the PCT Guidelines IV III-4.3a).

6. In amending the application care should be taken not to extend the content of the application beyond that of the application as filed, by the addition or deletion of subject-matter, in order to meet the requirements of Articles 19 (2) and 34(2) (b) PCT.

Moreover, in order to expedite the procedure the applicant is requested to indicate with his reply the locations in the application as originally filed of the passages forming a basis for any amendments which are made. If the applicant regards it as appropriate, these indications should be submitted in handwritten form on a copy of the relevant parts of the application as filed.

The applicant is requested to file amendments by way of replacement pages. He should also take into account the requirements of Rule 66.8 PCT. In particular, fair copies of the amendments should be filed in triplicate.

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

105972 84

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

REC'D 27 MAY 2005

WIPO

PCT

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

4/8

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
see form PCT/ISA/220

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**  
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
PCT/B2005/050188

International filing date (day/month/year)  
17.01.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)  
20.01.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
G06F17/60

Applicant  
KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☒ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

### 2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1b/s(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office  
D-80298 Munich  
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d  
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Gabriel, C

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7112





**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/B2005/050188

**Box No. I Basis of the opinion**

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.  
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:  
☐ a sequence listing  
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:  
☐ in written format  
☐ in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:  
☐ contained in the international application as filed.  
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/IB2005/050188

---

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

---

**1. Statement**

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	3-5,7,8,10,16,21
	No: Claims	1,2,6,9,11-15,17-20,22
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-22
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-22
	No: Claims	

**2. Citations and explanations**

**see separate sheet**

---

**Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application**

---

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

**see separate sheet**

**Re Item V**

**Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;  
citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. The following documents (D1-D4) are referred to in this communication; the numbering will be adhered to in the rest of the procedure:

D1: US 2002/178086 A1 (MARGESON JAYE A ET AL) 28 November 2002 (2002-11-28)

D2: US 2002/056109 A1 (TOMSEN MAI-LAN) 9 May 2002 (2002-05-09)

D3: US 2003/093794 A1 (THOMAS MCGEE ET AL) 15 May 2003 (2003-05-15)

D4: KWAN W ET AL: "AN INTELLIGENT AGENT FOR MULTIMEDIA  
NEWSPAPER" 1995, CANADIAN CONFERENCE ON ELECTRICAL AND  
COMPUTER ENGINEERING, PAGE(S) 594-597 , XP000568999

2. Method claim 1 and corresponding independent system claim 13 do not meet the requirements of Article 33(2) PCT for lack of novelty of their subject-matter. The reasons are the following:

- 2.1 Document discloses, according to all of the features of claim 1,

a computerized method for providing a personalized list of future meetings per subject per user based upon the user's preferences (paragraph 59), comprising the steps of:

obtaining a profile listing various meeting preferences of a user ("seminar topic of interest"; "other preference data" in paragraph 59);

obtaining a list of meetings corresponding to at least a portion of the user's profile, for preparation of a recommended meetings list ("seminars of interest" in paragraph 59); and

sending the user the list of recommended meetings ("email"; "appropriate notification" in paragraph 59).

Hence, claim 1 does not meet the requirements of Article 33(2) PCT for lack of novelty of its subject-matter.

- 2.2 The corresponding system of independent claim 13 for performing the method of claim 1 is also known from document D1 (figures 1,2; paragraph 59).

Hence, claim 13 does also not meet the requirements of Article 33(2) PCT for lack of novelty of its subject-matter.

3. Method claim 1 and independent system claim 13 do not meet the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT for lack of inventive step of their subject-matter. The reasons are the following:

- 3.1 Document D2 discloses,

a computerized method for providing a personalized list of [information items] per subject per user based upon the user's preferences (paragraph 38), comprising the steps of:

obtaining a profile listing various [information items] preferences of a user (paragraphs 44, 49, 51, 52);

obtaining a list of [information items] corresponding to at least a portion of the user's profile, for preparation of a recommended [information items] list ("merchant content / information" in paragraph 44); and

sending the user the list of recommended [information items] (implicit feature of viewing the information presented on a web-site in paragraph 44).

The difference between the subject-matter of claim 1 and the disclosure of D2 is that the information items presented are not merchant content/information, but meeting information.

This difference does however not constitute a technical difference, because the type of information displayed has no effect on the technical working of the system

performing the steps of claim 1.

Since the subject-matter of claim 1 does not differ from the disclosure of D2 in a technical way, a technical problem can not be formulated. If no such technical problem can be formulated, an inventive step can not be acknowledged.

Consequently, claim 1 does not meet the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT for lack of inventive step of its subject-matter.

It is to be noted that claim 1 does also not meet the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT in respect of document D3 (paragraphs 11, 19 and 21), which also discloses the provisioning of information based on a user profile.

- 3.2 The difference between the system of independent claim 13 and the system disclosed in document D2 (figure 3 and accompanying text) is the same non-technical difference as identified above in respect of claim 1.

Hence, claim 13 does also not meet the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT for lack of inventive step of its subject-matter for similar reasons as identified in section 3.1 above.

4. Dependent claims 2-12 and 14-22 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step, the reasons being as follows:

- 4.1 The features of claims 2-4, 10, 14-16 and 21, of determining a user profile based on questions, by monitoring website activities, or by using similar profiles, are known from document D2 (paragraphs 44, 49, 51 and 52).
- 4.2 The features of claims 5-8, 11, 12, 17-20 and 21, of searching the Internet for meetings and associated information, are obvious for finding information specified in the user's profile. See also document D1, paragraph 56 and 59; document D3,

paragraph 11, 19 and 21; or document D4, page 595, left-hand column, first paragraph, which all disclose relevant teachings related to the search of the Internet using explicit or implicit user profiles.

4.3 The use of E-mail, in claim 9, is known from document D1 (paragraph 59).

4.4 Dependent claims 2-12 and 14-22 do therefore also not meet the requirements of Article 33(2),(3) PCT for lack of novelty and/or inventive step of their subject-matter.

**Re Item VII**

**Certain defects in the international application**

In addition, the following requirements should also be attended to in an amended application to be filed:

1. To meet the requirements of Rule 6.3 (b) (i) and (ii) PCT, newly filed independent claims should be properly cast in the two part form, with those features which are part of the prior art (see document D1) being placed in the preamble.
2. The features of the claims should be provided with reference signs placed in **parenthesis** to increase the intelligibility of the claims (Rule 6.2 (b) PCT). This applies to both the preamble and the characterising portion of all claims.
3. In order to indicate more completely the background art useful for understanding the invention, the above-mentioned documents D1-D3 should be acknowledged in the description (Rule 5.1 (a) (ii) PCT).
4. When filing amended claims the applicant should at the same time bring the description into conformity with the amended claims (Rule 5.1 (a) (iii) PCT).
5. The vague and imprecise statement ("which modifications are meant to be covered by the spirit and scope of the appended claims") in the last line of the description on

page 7 implies that the subject-matter for which protection is sought may be different to that defined by the claims, thereby resulting in lack of clarity (Article 6 PCT) when used to interpret them (see also the PCT Guidelines IV III-4.3a).

6. In amending the application care should be taken not to extend the content of the application beyond that of the application as filed, by the addition or deletion of subject-matter, in order to meet the requirements of Articles 19 (2) and 34(2) (b) PCT.

Moreover, in order to expedite the procedure the applicant is requested to indicate with his reply the locations in the application as originally filed of the passages forming a basis for any amendments which are made. If the applicant regards it as appropriate, these indications should be submitted in handwritten form on a copy of the relevant parts of the application as filed.

The applicant is requested to file amendments by way of replacement pages. He should also take into account the requirements of Rule 66.8 PCT. In particular, fair copies of the amendments should be filed in triplicate.